

From: Brian K. Rineberg
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 1:26pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

In the year's past you have shown no genuine concern for the "CONSUMER". This latest settlement further amplifies the general consensus within the DOJ and individual states Attorney General. That is to stifle the consumers actual wants and needs. This latest settlement does nothing to "HELP" the consumer, it just gives OEM manufacturers the opportunity to provide an onslaught of advertising to unsuspecting consumers.

I am often called in to "clean up" a messy OEM installation of an operating system containing links, icons and registry settings the consumer had no idea was to be included on their new computer. These advertisements are an intrusion and should be disallowed in all cases.

If an OEM manufacturer develops a contract with an ISP for example, the ISP can simply provide software in the form distributable media such as a compact disc. This will save the consumer both time and money by allowing them to simply discard the unwanted inclusions.

There is just one question needed to be answered. What gives "ANY" solution provider the "RIGHT" to include anything a consumer does not specifically ask for? The answer is quite simple. They have no right, no matter what licensing agreement they have with the manufacturer of the in question operating system.

I am insulted by the inclusion of the word "consumer" interjected into this battle between competitor's. Lawyers and State Attorneys General have no idea what is best for the consumer. They have only the best interest of the competitor or campaign supporter providing the question.

When I purchase a corkscrew, I get a corkscrew, nothing more.

Brian Rineberg
San Marcos, CA